

## **APPENDIX 3**

# **BROADWAY, HENDON BNP VIABILITY REPORT**



**BNP PARIBAS  
REAL ESTATE**

Real Estate  
for a changing  
world

## **Review of “Affordable Housing Viability Study”**

**60-68 The Broadway, West Hendon**

Prepared for  
London Borough of Barnet

June 2016



## Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Background and description of the Development	5
3	Methodology	6
4	Review of Assumptions	7
5	Appraisal Results	12
6	Conclusion	14

## Appendices

Appendix 1 - Argus Appraisal 100% private housing

Nicholas Pe MRICS  
Associate Director – Development Consulting  
BNP Paribas Real Estate  
5 Aldermanbury Square  
London EC2V 7BP

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] [k](#)

# 1 Introduction

BNP Paribas Real Estate was commissioned by the London Borough of Barnet (“the Council”) to advise on the development (“the Development”) of 60-68 The Broadway, West Hendon, London NW9 7AE (“the Site”) submitted by Turner Morum (“TM”) on behalf of Topsy Turvey Design Ltd (“the Applicant”).

This report provides an independent assessment of TM’s Affordable Housing Viability Statement to determine whether the affordable housing offer as proposed has been optimised.

## 1.1 BNP Paribas Real Estate

BNP Paribas Real Estate is a leading firm of chartered surveyors, town planning and international property consultants. The practice offers an integrated service from nine offices in eight cities within the United Kingdom and over 180 offices, across 37 countries in Europe, Middle East, India and the United States of America, including 16 wholly owned and 21 associates. In 2005, the firm expanded through the acquisition of eight offices of Chesterton and in 2007, the firm acquired the business of Fuller Perrier. We are a wholly owned subsidiary of BNP Paribas, which is the number one bank in France, the second largest bank in the Euro Zone and one of the top rated banks worldwide.

BNP Paribas Real Estate has a wide ranging client base, acting for international companies and individuals, banks and financial institutions, private companies, public sector corporations, government departments, local authorities and registered providers (“RPs”).

The full range of property services includes:

- Planning and development consultancy;
- Affordable housing consultancy;
- Valuation and real estate appraisal;
- Property investment;
- Agency and Brokerage;
- Property management;
- Building and project consultancy; and
- Corporate real estate consultancy.

This report has been prepared by Nicholas Peirce MRICS, RICS Registered Valuer under the supervision of Anthony Lee MRTPI, MRICS, RICS Registered Valuer.

The Affordable Housing Consultancy of BNP Paribas Real Estate advises landowners, developers, local authorities and RPs on the provision of affordable housing.

In 2007, we were appointed by the Greater London Authority (“GLA”) to review its ‘Development Control Toolkit Mode’ (commonly referred to as the ‘Three Dragons’ mode). This review included testing the validity of the Three Dragons’ approach to appraising the value of residential and mixed use developments; reviewing the variables used in the mode and advising on areas that required amendment in the re-worked toolkit and other available appraisal modes and submitted our report in February 2012.

In addition, we are retained by the Homes and Communities Agency (“HCA”) to advise on better management of procurement of affordable housing through planning obligations.

The firm has extensive experience of advising landowners, developers, local authorities and RPs on the value of affordable housing and economic and social sustainable residential developments.

## 1.2 Report structure

This report is structured as follows:

- **Section two** provides a brief description of the Development and planning history;

- **Section three** describes the methodology that has been adopted;
- **Section four** outlines the inputs adopted within our appraisals;
- **Section five** sets out the results of the appraisals;
- Finally, in **Section six**, we draw conclusions from the analysis.

### **1.3 The Status of our advice**

In accordance with PS 1.6 of the RICS Valuation – Professional Standards (January 2014 Edition) (the 'Red Book'), the provisions of VPS1 to VPS4 are not of mandatory application and accordingly this report should not be relied upon as a Red Book valuation.

The reports addressed to the London Borough of Barnet only and should not be reproduced without our consent.

---

## 2 Background and description of the Development

### 2.1 The Site and proposed Development

The 0.19 hectare (0.47 acre) Application Site is located on West Hendon Broadway to the north of Brent Park Road and west of the M1. Hendon Railway Station is within 0.5 miles providing access to London St Pancras within 15 minutes and onward journeys via the wider London Underground Network. The Site currently comprises a Tile and Sanitaryware Showroom. The surrounding properties are primarily used for commercial and residential purposes.

According to the planning application, the proposed Developments for:

*“Demolition of existing building (Tile and Sanitaryware Showroom) and erection of an 8 storey mixed use building with 1,230 square metres of Sui Generis use (Tile and Sanitaryware showroom) on ground and first floors and 48 no self-contained residential units on the upper floors with green roof and solar panels. Provisions for basement parking, external parking spaces, cycle storage, refuse and amenity space.”*

### 3 Methodology

TM have undertaken the r assessment of the proposed Deve opment us ng a bespoke mode .

We have undertaken our assessment us ng Argus Deve oper (“Argus”). Argus s a commerc a y ava abe deve opment appra sa package n w despread use throughout the ndustry. It has been accepted by a number of oca p ann ng author tes for the purpose of v ab ty assessments and has a so been accepted at p ann ng appea s. Banks a so cons der Argus to be a re abe too for secured end ng va uat ons. Further deta s can be accessed at [www.argussoftware.com](http://www.argussoftware.com).

Argus s essent a y a cash-f ow mode . Such mode s a work on a s m ar bas s:

- F rst y, the va ue of the comp eted deve opment s assessed.
- Second y, the deve opment costs are ca cu ated, nc ud ng ether the prof t marg n requ red or and costs. In our appra sa s we nc ude prof t as a deve opment cost.

The d fference between the tota deve opment va ue and tota costs equates to the res dua and va ue (“RLV”). The mode s norma y set up to run over a deve opment per od from the date of the commencement of the project unt the project comp et on, when the deve opment has been constructed and s occup ed.

The cash-f ow approach a ows the f nance charges to be accurate y ca cu ated over the deve opment per od. Th s approach can accommodate more comp ex arrangements where a number of d fferent uses are prov ded or deve opment s phased.

In order to assess whether a deve opment scheme can be regarded as be ng econom ca y v abe t s necessary to compare the RLV that s produced w th a benchmark and va ue. If the Deve opment generates a RLV that s h gher than the benchmark t can be regarded as be ng econom ca y v abe and therefore capab e of prov d ng add tona affordab e hous ng. However, f the Deve opment generates a RLV that s ower than the benchmark t shou d be deemed econom ca y unv abe and the quantum of affordab e hous ng shou d be reduced unt v ab ty s ach eved.

We are of the op n on that Argus prov des an accurate ref ect on of the econom cs of the Deve opment subject of course to appropri ate nputs be ng adopted. Therefore we have adopted th s too for the purposes of our assessment.

## 4 Review of Assumptions

In this section, we review the assumptions adopted by TM for the purposes of running the appraisal of the Development.

### 4.1 Gross Development Value (“GDV”)

#### 4.1.1 Private sale residential values

The proposed Development comprises 48 residential units including one and two bedroom apartments.

TM have relied upon advice received from Rapleys with the average value assumed within the appraisal equating to £575 per square foot. A copy of the Rapleys report can be found in Appendix 3 of the TM report. For the avoidance of doubt, although TM have referred to the Rapleys report as ‘independent’, unless they sign a Duty of Care to both the Council and the Applicant, this is not the case.

We have reviewed the information provided by Rapleys as well as undertaking research into the local area through discussions with active local agents in addition to using our own research facilities.

#### Hendon Waterside – Phase 3A

Rapleys have correctly identified that Phase 3A is the latest phase to be brought forward comprising 358 new residential units ranging from 5 to 26 storeys in height. They have reported that the units located below the eighth floor reflect the following range in values:

Unit type	Value (£)	Average value (£)	Average value (£ psf)
One bedroom apartment	£280,000 - £320,000	£295,000	£570
Two bedroom apartment	£390,000 - £440,000	£415,000	£565

We are broadly in agreement with Rapleys regarding the values achieved at the scheme. However, Rapleys have failed to mention the date at which these units were sold. Each block has been built separately, with Block G2 comprising 71 affordable housing units completed in March 2015. Blocks E1/E3/E4 comprise 142 units; however we note that 120 units had sold by the end of Q2 2015. Surely Rapleys are not stating that values have not increased over the past 12 months in NW9? Land Registry data currently reports an increase of 4.38% over the past 12 months for flats in NW9.

A further item to note is that whilst we are in agreement with Rapleys that the units located on the upper floors are not directly comparable, we do not consider it appropriate to completely dismiss them. When looking at Block E2, we note that as at January 2016, 73 out of the 142 units were sold reflecting an average of £686 per square foot. The units were spread across a floors and so would generate a higher average than the proposed Development. However, in April 2016, the average price increased to £729 per square foot. At the very least, this demonstrates the level of growth currently experienced in this area.

#### Claremont Village

We are in agreement with Rapleys that the majority of this scheme has not yet been released to the market and is due in January 2017. However, we are aware of two two bedroom apartments currently on the market in Wexden House, namely ‘The Frost’ and ‘The Nissen’. The asking prices of £425,000 reflect a value of £647 per square foot.

We are aware that the apartment blocks within this scheme are no more than 5 storeys in height and in this aspect would be comparable to the proposed Development. In addition, as these units have just been released to the market, it provides an up to date comparison of what developers are seeking



to achieve at current day values rather than the more historic nature of a tentative comparative development.

#### **415 Edgware Road**

This development is regarded as a Private Rented Scheme ("PRS") and therefore does not form a basis from which we can identify appropriate build to sale achievable values.

#### **Silver Works**

Silver Works is currently being developed by Gard Homes, comprising 227 residential units. We are broadly in agreement with the values reported by Rapleys and acknowledge that the units within the scheme are significantly larger than those at the proposed Development. Whilst we are in agreement with Rapleys that this offers a 'ceiling price' for these unit types in this specific location, we draw attention to the fact that larger units often have a lower value on a 'per square foot' basis. This should be taken into account when using the development as a comparative scheme from which to derive values for the proposed residential units.

After due consideration of the evidence provided by Rapleys in addition to the research we have undertaken, we consider the average value of £575 per square foot across the proposed Development to be below current market expectations. We have therefore increased this value to £585 per square foot.

#### **4.1.2 Affordable housing revenue**

TM have based the proportion of affordable housing values on the following categories:

- Shared ownership units: 70% of Open Market Value ("OMV");
- Affordable rent units: 50% of OMV.

To value the affordable housing units, we have used a bespoke model specifically created for this purpose. This model takes into account factors such as standard fees for residential RPs management and maintenance costs; finance rates currently obtainable in the sector, and a view on the amount of grant that may be obtainable.

The 'Affordable Homes Programme 2015-2018 Prospectus' document provides a clear indication that Section 106 schemes are unlikely to be allocated grant funding, except in exceptional circumstances. It is therefore considered imprudent to assume that Grant will be secured. Therefore our assessment relies upon the assumption that none is provided.

TM refer to the recent budget Summer Budget (2015) with particular attention to the reduction in rents for social housing in England by 1% a year for 4 years. For the avoidance of doubt, we can confirm that our model takes all changes into account including those stated by TM in the report.

#### **4.1.3 Ground rents**

TM have assumed ground rents at the following rental values within the appraisal, capitalised at a 5.5% yield:

- Studio apartments: £250 per unit per annum;
- Two bedroom apartments: £300 per unit per annum; and
- Three bedroom apartments: £350 per unit per annum.

Whilst we consider the assumed rental values to be reasonable, we have reduced the yield from 5.5% to 5% to reflect current market expectations. We have deducted purchasers' costs at 5.8%.

#### **4.1.4 Commercial revenue and yield**

The proposed Development includes commercial space equating to 15,699 square feet for showroom purposes. TM have relied upon advice received from Rapleys who have concluded that the

commercial space would generate a capital value of circa £3,000,000. A copy of the Rapleys report can be found in Appendix 3 of the TM assessment.

We have undertaken research into the local market through discussions with active local agents in addition to using online research facilities. We consider the assumptions included by Rapleys in the assessment of the proposed commercial space to be reasonable and have therefore adopted them within our assessment.

#### **4.1.5 Car parking**

The proposed Development includes 48 car parking spaces for the residential units within the basement. There will also be 11 external ground floor parking spaces for the commercial units including a dedicated bay. It appears that TM have not included a separate revenue for the car parking spaces within the appraisal; we therefore assume that they have assumed that they will be allocated to each residential unit at no extra cost.

We have adopted this position in our appraisal; however we recommend that the Council include a statement within the Section 106 Agreement whereby the car parking spaces cannot be sold for an additional cost. If this is not agreed to, we will need to update our appraisal to reflect the situation.

### **4.2 Development costs**

#### **4.2.1 Construction costs**

TM have relied upon a construction cost plan prepared by McBurns Cooper who have concluded that the total cost of the proposed Development equates to £10,306,000 reflecting a cost of £149 per square foot (inclusive of tender inflation and contingency).

We have compared this cost plan to schemes of similar size and complexity within the surrounding area. After due consideration, we are of the opinion that these costs are reasonable in the current market and have adopted them for the purposes of our appraisal.

Notwithstanding the above, it should be noted that if the Council have concerns over the construction costs assumed by TM in the appraisal, an independent cost consultant should be instructed to undertake an independent review of the cost plan.

#### **4.2.2 Contingency**

McBurns Cooper have included an allowance for contingency within the construction cost plan at 2%. We do not consider this to be above current market expectations and have therefore adopted it within our appraisal.

#### **4.2.3 Professional fees**

TM have assumed professional fees in the appraisal at 8% of construction costs. Taking into account the complexity of the scheme, we consider this allowance to be reasonable and have adopted it in our assessment.

#### **4.2.4 Interest**

TM have assumed a debt rate of 6.5% within the appraisal. We do not consider this assumption to be above current market expectations and have adopted it within our appraisal.

Although a bank would not provide 100% of the funding required for the proposed Development it is conventional to assume finance on a cost in order to reflect the opportunity (or in some cases the actual cost) of committing equity to the project.

#### **4.2.5 Marketing costs**

TM have assumed the following costs within the appraisal:

- Private residential units: 3% of GDV for sales agent and marketing fees;
- Affordable housing units: 0.5% of GDV for disposal costs; and
- Commercial disposal costs at 2% of GDV.

We consider these assumptions to be reasonable in the current market and have adopted them within our assessment.

#### **4.2.6 Planning obligations**

TM have not included any allowance for Section 106 payments within the appraisal. At present, we have adopted this position within our appraisal; however this is on a 'subject to confirmation' basis. We are in agreement with TM that any additional payments would have an impact on the viability of the scheme and this would need to be factored into the assessment conclusion.

We note that TM have not included any CIL payments within the appraisal. This is a non-negotiable payment that is required on all developments, subject to any stated exemptions. We have adopted the following CIL payments within our appraisal, subject to confirmation from the Council:

- Mayor's CIL: £128,954; and
- Borough CIL: £497,395.

#### **4.2.7 Developer's return**

TM have assumed varying levels of profit for the different elements of the proposed development. We have summarised these profit levels below:

- Private residential element: 20% of GDV;
- Affordable housing element: 6% of revenue; and
- Commercial space: 15% of GDV.

We consider these assumptions to be within the ranges we currently experience within the market. However, we note that the profit assumption of 20% of GDV for the private residential units is at the top of the acceptable range. Prior to the result of the referendum on the UK's membership of the European Union, developers were targeting profit levels of between 17% - 20% of private housing GDV. Up to that point, sales risk was perceived to be lower than during the housing market recession of 2008 to 2012. However, the current uncertainty associated with the future of the UK's membership of the European Union has created uncertainty which may undermine some buyers' confidence to a degree. In this context, financial institutions are likely to tighten the requirement for profit returns on developments. As a consequence, target profit levels are expected to increase back up to 20% in the short term.

The reduced profit on affordable housing reflects the risk of delivery. The developer will contract with an RP prior to commencement of construction and they are – in effect – acting as a contractor, with the risk limited to cost only. After contracting with the RP, there is no sales risk. In contrast, the private housing construction will typically commence before any units are sold and sales risks present well into the development period.

We consider the profit assumption of 15% of GDV for the commercial space to be reasonable in the current market.

### **4.3 Project timetable**

TM have adopted the following timescales for development:

- Pre-construction period: 3 months;
- Construction period: 12 months; and
- Sales period: 9 months.

---

Whilst we consider the pre-construction and construction periods to be reasonable, we have concerns over the length of the sales period. After due consideration, we have assumed off-plan sales of 50% with the remaining units sold over 6 months reflecting a sales rate of 4 units per month.

## 5 Appraisal Results

In this section, we consider the outputs of the appraisal and the implications for the provision of affordable housing at the proposed Development.

### 5.1 Viability benchmark

TM have relied upon an Existing Use Valuation (“EUUV”) prepared by Rapleys to establish an appropriate viability benchmark. We consider this method to be reasonable and have therefore adopted it within our appraisal. Within the report, Rapleys have concluded that the EUUV is £3,550,000; however we note that TM have then added stamp duty and legal fees to the valuation resulting in a total value of £3,754,000. We are confused as to why the stamp duty and legal fees have been added, and assume that this is an error in the valuation, as purchasers’ costs are deducted from value.

We have been provided with the floor areas of the existing building within the Rapleys report. We have not undertaken a measured survey of the property and therefore our assessment of the EUUV is based upon these figures. If these figures are found to be inaccurate, this will impact on our appraisal. The areas have been summarised in the following table:

	Area (GIA / sq m)	Area (GIA / sq ft)
<b>Ground floor</b>		
Showroom	387.38	7,399
Warehouse / Product on Area	536.79	5,778
Reception / Office Space	32.42	349
Corridors / Toilets / Services / Stair Core	89.34	962
Sub-total	<b>1,345.93</b>	<b>14,487</b>
<b>First Floor</b>		
Showroom	129.74	1,396
Warehouse	976.83	10,515
Offices	179.94	1,936
Corridor / Kitchen / Services / Stair Core	118.15	1,272
Sub-total	<b>1,404.66</b>	<b>15,120</b>
<b>Total GIA</b>	<b>2,750.59</b>	<b>29,607</b>

Rapleys have applied rental values ranging between £5 per square foot and £16 per square foot for the differing areas of the existing building. The subsequent rental value has been captured at a 7.7% annualised reflecting a capital value of £120 per square foot. This capital value has been compared to 38 Waterloo Road located within 1.1 miles of the Application Site.

After due consideration, whilst we do not disagree with the method by which Rapleys have undertaken the assessment of the EUUV, we consider the capital value of £120 per square foot to be above what is considered to be reasonable for a building of this nature. We have taken into account the condition of the existing units in comparison to the condition of the comparable evidence provided by Rapleys. We have therefore marginally reduced the capital value to £115 per square foot. This has therefore reduced the total value from £3,550,000 to £3,404,805 for the EUUV.

In the report, TM have reserved the right to apply a landowner premium to incentivise the landowner to bring the Site forward for development. We are in agreement with this method; however we do not understand why TM have reserved the right to revert this assumption and are concerned that this would enable them to retrofit the assumptions. We have therefore undertaken an assessment of the

appropriate and owner premium to avoid any confusion at a later date. We have assumed a and owner premium of 10% within our assessment that has increased the EUV from £3,404,805 to £3,745,285.

For the avoidance of doubt, we have adopted the value of £3,745,285 as our viability benchmark. This is in comparison to the assumed benchmark of £3,754,000 proposed by TM.

## 5.2 Appraisal results

In our review of TM's assumptions we recommend the following amendments:

- Increase private residential values to reflect current market expectations; and
- Ground rent yield reduced from 5.5% to 5%.

We have undertaken an appraisal of the proposed Development with the Applicant's offer of a 100% private housing by units taking into account the alterations recommended above. We have concluded that the proposed Development generates a Residual Land Value ("RLV") of £2,283,236 providing a deficit of £1,462,049 against the viability benchmark.

### Gross to net ratio of the proposed Development

In our analysis of the proposed Development, we note that the gross to net ratio is significantly below the level usually expected within the current market. This has had a considerable impact on the viability of the scheme with the quantum of space that is 'revenue generating' significantly lower than the quantum of space that is regarded as a 'cost' to the development.

## 6 Conclusion

TM have concluded in the assessment of the proposed Development that the scheme with 100% private housing is unviable against the viability benchmark.

Due to the alterations recommended in paragraph 5.2, we consider the proposed Development to be unviable against the viability benchmark generating a deficit of £1,462,049.

In an attempt to understand the reasons behind the conclusion that the proposed Development is unviable with 100% private housing, we have undertaken further analysis of the scheme. One item of note is the gross to net area ratio with the proposed Development, which we have calculated to be approximately 62%. Typically, we would expect a residential development to achieve circa 85% and therefore regard the proposed Development as being inefficient. It is this inefficient ratio that is generating the large costs and limited revenue generating areas. If the gross to net ratio was improved, we would see a significant improvement in the viability of the scheme.

In a 'high level' sensitivity analysis, we have improved the gross to net ratio from 62% to 85% to establish the impact this would have on the viability of the scheme. To do this, we have applied the cost rate on a 'per square metre' basis as proposed by the Applicant's advisors for the proposed Development, to a smaller Gross Internal Floor Area ("GIFA") reflecting a gross to net ratio of 85%. We acknowledge that this is 'high level' and that scheme specifics would need to be addressed; however our analysis provides an indication of the outcome of a scheme that has an improved efficiency. We have concluded that the alternative scheme would generate a RLV of £4,971,220 providing a surplus of £1,225,935 against the viability benchmark. This surplus could be used for further Section 106 payments (should this be justifiable in planning terms), a commuted sum payment or affordable housing provisions.

The sensitivity of the scheme to react to price growth means that we recommend the Council include a review mechanism within the Section 106 agreement.

---

## Appendix 1 - Argus Appraisal 100% private housing



# BNP Paribas Real Estate

## Development Appraisal

60-68 West Hendon Broadway

Report Date: 28 June 2016

Prepared by BNPPRE

**APPRAISAL SUMMARY****BNP PARIBAS REAL ESTATE**

60-68 West Hendon Broadway

## Summary Appraisal for Phase 1

Currency in £

**REVENUE**

Sales Valuation	Units	ft <sup>2</sup>	Rate ft <sup>2</sup>	Unit Price	Gross Sales
Studio apartments	6	2,268	585.00	221,130	1,326,780
One bedroom apartments	30	16,680	580.00	322,480	9,674,400
Two bedroom apartments	<u>12</u>	<u>8,484</u>	575.00	406,525	<u>4,878,300</u>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>27,432</b>			<b>15,879,480</b>

**Rental Area Summary**

	Units	ft <sup>2</sup>	Rate ft <sup>2</sup>	Initial MRV/Unit	Net Rent at Sale	Initial MRV
Ground rents - studio apartments	6			250	1,500	1,500
Ground rents - one bedroom apartments	30			300	9,000	9,000
Ground rents - two bedroom apartments	12			350	4,200	4,200
Commercial space	<u>1</u>	<u>15,699</u>		0	<u>0</u>	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>15,699</b>			<b>14,700</b>	<b>14,700</b>

**Investment Valuation**

<b>Ground rents - studio apartments</b>					
Current Rent	1,500	YP @	5.0000%	20.0000	30,000
<b>Ground rents - one bedroom apartments</b>					
Current Rent	9,000	YP @	5.0000%	20.0000	180,000
<b>Ground rents - two bedroom apartments</b>					
Current Rent	4,200	YP @	5.0000%	20.0000	84,000
<b>Commercial space</b>					
Manual Value					3,000,000
					<b>3,294,000</b>

**GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE** 19,173,480

Purchaser's Costs	6.80%	(223,992)	(223,992)
-------------------	-------	-----------	-----------

**NET DEVELOPMENT VALUE** 18,949,488**NET REALISATION** 18,949,488

**APPRAISAL SUMMARY****BNP PARIBAS REAL ESTATE**

60-68 West Hendon Broadway

**OUTLAY****ACQUISITION COSTS**

Residual Price		2,283,236	
Stamp Duty	4.00%	91,329	
Agent Fee	1.00%	22,832	
Legal Fee	0.50%	11,416	
			2,408,814

**CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

Mayor's CIL		128,954	
Borough CIL		497,395	
			626,349

**Other Construction**

Construction costs		10,306,000	
			10,306,000

**PROFESSIONAL FEES**

Professional fees	8.00%	824,480	
			824,480

**MARKETING & LETTING**

Marketing	3.00%	476,384	
			476,384

**DISPOSAL FEES**

Commercial disposal fees	2.00%	61,400	
			61,400

**Additional Costs**

Profit on private residential	20.00%	3,234,696	
Profit on commercial	15.00%	450,000	
			3,684,696

**FINANCE**

Debt Rate 6.500% Credit Rate 0.000% (Nominal)			
Land		188,264	
Construction		355,226	
Other		17,874	
Total Finance Cost			561,364

**TOTAL COSTS****18,949,488**

60-68 West Hendon Broadway

**PROFIT****0****Performance Measures**

Profit on Cost%	0.00%
Profit on GDV%	0.00%
Profit on NDV%	0.00%
Development Yield% (on Rent)	0.08%
Equivalent Yield% (Nominal)	5.00%
Equivalent Yield% (True)	5.16%
IRR	6.00%
Profit Erosion (finance rate 6.500%)	N/A